E.C. No. 526

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1967-68)

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING

(DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT)

Bombay Port, Part I

Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Ninety-Sixth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the erstwhile Ministry of Transport— Bombay Port, Part I

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 1968/Phalguna, 1889 (Saka)
Price : Rs. 65 Paise.

· 395 /

LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
	ANDHRA PRADESH	
1.	Andhra University General Cooperative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam).	8
2.	G. R. Lakshmipathy Chetty and Sons, General Merchants and News Agents, Newpet, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.	94
	ASSAM	
3.	Western Book Depot, Pan Bazar, Gauhati.	7
	BIHAR	
4.	Amar Kitab Ghar, Post Box 78, Diagonal Road, Jamshedpur.	37
	GUJARAT	
5.	Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand.	35
6.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6.	63
	MADHYA PRADESH	
7.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City.	13
	MAHARASHTRA	
8.	M/s Sunderdas Gianchand, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princess Street, Bombay-2.	6
9.	The International Book House (Private) Limited, 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1.	22
10.	The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.	26
11.	Charles Lambert & Company, 101, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Opposite Clock Tower, Fort, Bombay.	
12.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1.	
13.	Deccan Book Stall, Ferguson College Road, Poona-4.	
	RAJASTHAN	
14.	Information Centre, Government of Rajasthan, Tripolia, Jaipur City.	38
	UTTAR PRADESH	
15.	Swastik Industrial Works, 59, Holi Street, Meerut City.	2
16.	Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1.	48
	WEST BENGAL	
17.	Granthaloka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia, 24 Parganas.	10
18.	W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta.	44
19.	Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 6/1A, Banchharam Akrur Lane, Calcutta-12.	82
	DELHI	
20.	Jain Book Agency, Connaught Place, New Delhi.	1

CORRIGENDA
To

Thirty-third Report of the Estimates Committee (Fourth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Transpor and Shipping - Bombay Port (Part I).

....

Page 1, para 2, line 3, for 'Engineering' read 'Engineers'.

Page 3, line 3, for 'component' read 'competen

Page 13, line 3, for 'effect' read 'effort'.

Page 15, line 5, for 'Further Information call for by the Committee' read 'Further reply of the Government'.

Page 15, lines 9-10, add "works, such as the first phase of the satellite' after 'major' in line 9 and before 'port'.

Page 23, line 4, insert the date '12.12.1966'.

Page 25, Recommendation S.No.19, line 4, for 'and collection' read 'and collation'.

Page 27, Recommendation S.No.24, line 8, for 'down' read 'round'.

Page 28, Recommendation S.No.29, line 6, for 'train' read 'strain'.

Page 30, Recommendation S.No.31, line 13, for 'appropriate' read 'appropriated'.

Page 31, Recommendation S.No.31, line 14, for 'it' read 'if'.

Page 37, Recommendation S.No.37, Further Reply, line 3, for 'pf' read 'of'.

Page 39, Recommendation S.No.40, Reply, line 2, for 'posts' read 'ports'.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE		(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE STUDY GROUP 'F'		(v)
INTRODUCTION		(vii)
CHAPTER I	Report	1
CHAPTER II	Recommendations which have been accepted by Government	7
CHAPTER III	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply	46
CHAPTER IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee	51
APPENDIX	Analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 96th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)	56

3618 (aii) LS—1.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1967-68)

CHAIRMAN

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah

MEMBERS

2. Shri Panna Lal Barupal
3. Shri Onkar Lal Berwa
4. Shri Maharaj Singh Bharti
5. Shri Bibhuti Mishra
6. Shri R. K. Birla
7. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu
8. Shri Tridib Chaudhuri
9. Shri Hardayal Devgun
10. Shri Y. Gadilingana Goud
11. Shri J. N. Hazarika
12. Shri J. M. Imam
13. Shri Tulshidas Jadhav
14. Shri Dhireshwar Kalita
15. Shri S. Kandappan
16. Shri Baij Nath Kureel
17. Shri Yashwant Singh Kushwah
18. Shri K. Lakkappa
19. Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai
20. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
21. Shri Inder J. Malhotra
22. Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal
23. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena
24. Shri F. H. Mohsin
25. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
26. Shri Rajdeo Singh
27. Shri Gajraj Singh Rao

28. Shrimati Jayaben Shah
29. Shri Shantilal Shah
30. Shri P. Sivasankaran

SECRETARIAT

Shri B. B. Tewari—*Deputy Secretary.*

Shri G. D. Sharma—*Under Secretary.*

STUDY GROUP 'F'

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1967-68)

CONVENER

Shri S. Kandappan

MEMBERS

2. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu
3. Shri Tridib Chaudhuri
4. Shri Y. Gadilingana Goud
5. Shri J. M. Imam
6. Shri Baij Nath Kureel
7. Shri K. Lakkappa
8. Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal
9. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena
10. Shri F. H. Mohsin
11. Shri Gajraj Singh Rao
12. Shrimati Jayaben Shah
13. Shri Shantilal Shah
14. Shri P. Sivasankaran

SECRETARIAT

Shri B. B. Tewari—*Deputy Secretary.*

Shri G. D. Sharma—*Under Secretary.*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Estimates Committee having been authorised by the Committee, present this Thirty-Third Report of the Estimates Committee on the Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Ninety-Sixth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the erstwhile Ministry of Transport—Bombay Port (Part I).

2. The Ninety-Sixth Report was presented to the Lok Sabha on the 30th March, 1966. Government furnished their replies to the recommendations, as also further information sought on 15 replies, between 6th December 1966 and 22nd November, 1967. All the replies were considered by Study Group 'F' of the Estimates Committee at their sitting held on the 22nd December 1967. The Report was adopted by the Committee on the 4th March, 1968.

3. The Report has been divided into the following Chapters:—

I Report.

II Recommendations which have been accepted by Government.

III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply.

IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee.

4. An analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Ninety-Sixth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) is given in the Appendix. It would be observed therefrom that out of 50 recommendations made in the Report, 41 recommendations *i.e.* 82 per cent have been accepted by Government and the Committee do not desire to pursue 6 recommendations *i.e.* 12 per cent in view of Government's reply. Replies of Government in respect of the remaining 3 recommendations *i.e.* 6 per cent, have not been accepted by the Committee.

P. VENKATASUBBAIAH,

Chairman,

Estimates Committee.

NEW DELHI;

March 6, 1968.

Phalguna 16, 1889 (*Saka*)

CHAPTER I

REPORT

Payment of Fees to Consulting Engineers.

Recommendations (Serial Nos. 21 and 22, Para 88)

In paras 86 to 88 of their Ninety-Sixth Report (Third Lok Sabha) on the erstwhile Ministry of Transport—Bombay Port (Part I), the Estimates Committee noted that the Bombay Port authorities had been appointing foreign firms as their consulting engineers from time to time to attend the following services—

(i) *General consultancy services and for acting as agents of the Bombay Port Trust in London for payment of pensions, annuities and provident fund, etc. and for engagement of personnel when required. For this, they are paid a fixed retention fee of £ 1,000 per annum. In addition they are paid a graduated commission on the value of purchases made through them as well as all out of pocket expenses such as travel, telegraph, telephone charges etc incurred by them in connection with port trust work;*

(ii) *Special consultancy service, involving extensive enquiries and technical work for example preparation of estimates, drawings, tender documents etc. for the Dock Expansion Scheme and Ballard Pier Extension. For this, the Consulting Engineers are paid a fee on percentage of the total value of the works to be executed. In the case of Dock Expansion Scheme, the fee payable is 3.25 per cent. on the first Rs. 3 crores and 3 per cent. on the balance.*

(iii) *In addition to the fees referred to above, the Port Trust also pays to the Consultants the actual cost of site supervision, cost of equipment required and other expenditure incurred by them in connection with the work. The cost of special professional advice or services of a contractor for carrying out site investigations, recommended by the consultants is also borne by the Port Trust.*

2. *The Committee noted that the Bombay Port Trust had paid £ 398,326 in foreign currency and Rs. 10.3 lakhs in rupees to the Consulting Engineering under various heads from 1948-49 to 1964-65. These*

amounts were exclusive of the reimbursements allowed to the Consulting Engineers on account of actual expenditure on staff for day-to-day site supervision which would also be quite substantial.

3. *Commenting on the appointment of foreign firms as Consulting Engineers and the mode of payment, the Committee did not appreciate fully the justification for the payment of annual retention fee of £ 1,300 to them for general consultancy work as they were to be paid separately for all special works and were reimbursed all expenditure incurred by them in connection with the port work. The Committee further noted that an appreciable number of engineers from the Port Trust Engineering Department were seconded to the Consulting Engineers. While the Committee appreciated in principle that the seconding of such officers might help them to get the requisite experience in port designing, they apprehended that such an arrangement was liable to create a vested interest and might come in the way of objective assessment of the work done by the Consultants, particularly when the same consulting firm had been continuing for over twenty years.*

4. *The Committee further observed that the payment of fees on percentage basis to the Consulting Engineers might give them unintended remuneration on account of increases in the cost of works, due to extraneous reasons like contractors' delays and failures, rise in the cost of labour, material etc and not so much due to additions to their work. They felt that such a system of payment provided no incentive to the Consulting Engineers to economise on costs of works. Rather, it tended to work the other way as the Consulting Engineers became direct beneficiaries from increases in costs. In this connection the Committee pointed out that the costs of marine oil terminal scheme increased from the original estimate of Rs. 4.49 crores to Rs. 10.25 crores. Similarly, the estimates of Dock Expansion Scheme had been revised upwards from Rs. 10.92 crores to Rs. 13.25 crores. The Committee felt that the fees of Consultants should be fixed in such a manner as to provide incentive for bringing about reduction in the costs of works. They recommended that Government should review the whole matter and lay down principles for the payment of fees to the Consulting engineers after taking the above factors into account. They further suggested that Government/Port Authorities should negotiate with the Consulting Engineers for adjusting their fees in respect of Dock Expansion Scheme and Master Plan in such a manner as to eliminate the accrual of fees on account of increases in cost of work due to extraneous factors.*

5. **In reply Government stated that "The retainer of £ 1,000/- per annum paid to the Consulting Engineers represents remuneration to**

them not only for general consultancy work but also for the agency work which they do for the Port Trust. By paying such a retainer, the Bombay Port Trust not only ensures that the services of a component and approved firm of consultants are readily available, whenever the need arises, but also that the Port Trust derives the benefit of a lower fee than that prescribed in the Consulting Engineers' Association's Rules, when any special assignments are entrusted to the Consultants. It is a normal practice for Consulting Engineers to quote a concessional fee to the clients who retain their services on a regular payment of a retention fee. For example, in the case of the Dock Expansion Scheme and Ballard Pier Extension, the fee prescribed by the Consulting Engineers' Association's Rules would be 5½ per cent on the first £500,000 4½ per cent on the next £500,000 and 4¼ per cent on the remaineder, while the fee payable under the agreement with the Consulting Engineers is 3¼ per cent on the first Rs. 3 crores and 3 per cent on the balance (excluding the work relating to the Passenger Terminal). The retainer paid to the Consultants is thus off-set by the saving arising from the concessional fee for the special assignments and can, therefore, be considered justifiable.

As regards the seconding of the Port Trust Engineers to the consultants for gaining experience in design work, it may be stated that the secondment is not for long duration and the consultants' work is assessed by senior engineers of the Port Trust, other than those who have been so seconded. Thus, the Port Trust's interests are fully safeguarded."

6. As regards payment of fees to the Consultants, the Government stated that "it is generally fixed on the basis prescribed by the Consulting Engineers' Association's Rules. Except in the cases of assignments in which the work required of the Consultants can be fairly assessed and a fixed fee can be quoted, it is the normal practice to fix the fee on the basis of a time rate or a percentage rate. Under the time rate basis, the fees are payable at an agreed rate for the time devoted to the work by the Consulting Engineers or their staff while under the percentage rate the fee is determined at an agreed percentage of the actual cost of the work. In large projects, the latter basis is commonly adopted as it provides a definite basis for calculating the fees. It is true that under this method of payment of fees, the Consultants stand to benefit by an increase in the cost of the work. Where such increases are due to an enhancement of the cost on account of additional work, the additional fee would no doubt be justified. But increase in the cost of work resulting from a rise in the cost of labour and materials, whether due to normal rise in the

price level or due to contractors' delays and failures, would mean an adventitious addition to the Consultants' fees; but the Consultants contend that any general increase in the price level during the period of their service affects them also in the form of higher salary bills and other expenses and would, therefore, be justified. It may, however, be possible to fix a fee on a percentage basis on the understanding that any increases in the cost due to an escalation in the cost of labour and material would not be taken into account for the calculation of the fee, but then the Consultants would invariably ask for a higher percentage to cover the risk of such escalation. This has been the experience in negotiating the terms for the Dock Expansion Scheme and Ballard Pier Extension with the Consulting Engineers. They quoted a fee of 3.7 per cent and 3.5 per cent without escalation, while they were prepared to accept 3¼ per cent and 3 per cent if escalation was included. As it was felt that the actual escalation would not amount to the extra fee quoted for excluding such escalation, the latter basis, which is also commonly adopted, was preferred.

So far as the Dock Expansion Scheme and Ballard Pier Extension are concerned, the terms were finalised more than four years ago and there does not appear to be any possibility of making any amendment therein at this stage for eliminating accrual of fees on account of cost increases due to extraneous factors. So far as the Master Plan is concerned, the Consulting Engineers are being paid a fixed fee, which is not subject to a change due to any extraneous factors and the question of considering any amendment therein should not, therefore, arise."

7. *The Committee are not convinced by the reasons advanced for justifying the payment of annual retention fee of £1,000 to the Consulting Engineers. The Committee while reiterating their observations made in the original recommendation would like the Ministry of Transport and Shipping to examine this matter carefully in consultation with the Ministry of Finance with a view to reduce the incidence of retention fee.*

8. *The Committee are also not satisfied with the system adopted by the port authorities for payment of fees to the consultants which are stated to be generally fixed on the basis prescribed by the Consulting Engineers Association Rules. It has been admitted by Govt. that under the present method of payment, particularly in the case of large projects, the consultants stand to gain by an increase in the cost of work resulting from a rise in the cost of labour and materials, whether due to normal rise in the price level or due to contractors'*

delays and failures. The Committee consider such a system of payment which puts premium on delays as defective. They feel that the existing system of payment of fees on percentage basis provides no incentive to the Consulting Engineers to economise on costs. As payment of fees to consultants has an important bearing on the final cost of the project as a whole, the Committee would like to reiterate that the whole matter may be reviewed carefully so as to lay down principles for future guidance in this respect. They would suggest that a Committee with representatives drawn from the Ministries of Finance and Transport and Shipping and all Major Ports may be set up to go into this matter and after studying the practice obtaining in various countries other than Britain make suggestions to determine the fees of Consultants in such a manner as would result in economy, efficiency and expedition in the execution of Port schemes.

Cargoes confiscated by Customs but left uncleared by them.

Recommendation (Serial No. 39, Para 118)

9. *In para 118 of the Report the Committee noted that out of 85,754 packages lying uncleared, 12,920 (i.e. 14 per cent) packages were those which had been confiscated, outright by the Customs. They were further perturbed to note that of the confiscated packages as many as 3563 packages were awaiting disposal after 2 years of confiscation by Customs. The Committee suggested that save in sub-judice cases, the Customs Department should expeditiously arrange to hold auctions in suitable lots at frequent intervals to dispose of goods to avoid congestion in the port area and prevent their deterioration due to long storage.*

10. *In reply, Government stated that "The attention of the Collector of Customs is being invited to the suggestion of the Committee. Apart from this, Port Trust have been constantly urging the Custom House to expedite sales, by auction, of goods confiscated outright where such goods are not* 'sub-judice'.

11. *When the Committee asked for the latest position regarding action taken by the Customs and the number of packages awaiting disposal, Government replied as under:—*

> *"Out of 3563 packages confiscated by the Customs and referred to herein, 1352 packages have been disposed of by sale by public auction by the Customs authorities as at date. The balance quantity awaiting disposal is 2211 packages."*

12. *The Committee are unhappy to note the slow progress in the disposal of the confiscated packages lying in the port during the last two years. They find that out of 3563 packages only 1352 packages have been disposed of so far. Since the confiscated packages in question pertain to the years 1959 to 1964, the Committee would like to urge that the disposal of the remaining packages as also those accumulated after 1964 should be accelerated without further delay in accordance with the provisions contained in the Bombay Port Act, 1879.*

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Serial No. 1, Para 1)

The Committee feel that with the proposed extension of the port operations beyond the existing port limits, and the proposed construction of a satellite port at Nhava-Sheva it is imperative that the port authorities should have administrative control over the actual area of its operations, both on the water and land, so that the port operations are carried out unhampered, by a single authority without any administrative or procedural difficulties.

They would suggest that Government may constitute a technical committee consisting of representatives of Ministries of Transport, Railways, Finance etc. and the representatives of State Governments of Maharashtra to examine carefully the question of extending the jurisdiction of the port having regard to the plans for developing the satellite port of Nhava-Sheva and of ensuring efficient port operations.

Reply of Government

The Consulting Engineers of Bombay Port are at present engaged in the preparation of a Master Plan for the future development of Bombay Port. The proposal to set up a statellite port at Nhava-Sheva forms part of the Master Plan Study. A clear picture about the exact location of the satellite port and the nature of facilities to be provided there will emerge only after the Master Plan report is ready. The Committee's recommendation regarding the constitution of a technical committee for examining the question of extending the jurisdiction of the port will be considered after the receipt of the report on the Master Plan.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 10-11-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 2, Para 14)

The Committee are glad to note that the total traffic passing through the port has increased from 10·4 million tonnes in 1965-66 to 17·3 million tonnes in 1964-65, thereby registering a rise of about 66 per cent during the decade.

The Committee, however, note that whereas the rise in imports during the last ten years has been of the order of about 78 per cent, exports have risen only by about 43 per cent during the same period.

The Committee consider that till such time as Dock Expansion Scheme is implemented there is need to find ways and means of affording relief to the congested Port of Bombay by diverting some of the import traffic to neighbouring ports. The Committee would like Government to consider in particular the question of diverting some of the inward cargo of food grains and fertilisers to other neighbouring ports like Kandla and Mormugao.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's recommendations have been noted. Wherever congestion is anticipated at Bombay Port, traffic is diverted to other ports.

So far as foodgrain traffic is concerned, increasing use is being made of Kandla Port.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDP(36)/66, dated 19-5-1967*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 3, Para 18)

The Committee regret to note that the scheme for the extension of the Ballard Pier and the construction of a new passenger terminal building which was included in the Second Plan, has not yet made much headway. The Committee consider that passenger amenities at Ballard Pier need improvement to bring them in line with international standards as that would go a long way in attracting overseas passenger traffic, particularly the foreign tourists.

The Committee would like passenger amenities at Ballard Pier to be such as to attract ships carrying tourists on World cruise as this is bound to help the country in earning some valuable foreign exchange.

The Committee have no doubt, that in deciding the scale and standard of amenities to be provided at Ballard Pier, Government make a careful study of the requirements of passenger traffic over the next 15—20 years as also the passenger amenities which have been provided in other countries e.g. Italy, Spain, Lebanon etc. for attracting tourist traffic.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

It is agreed that the facilities at the Passenger Terminal should be of a standard comparable to those at other international ports. The consulting Engineers have kept this in mind in framing their proposals and provision has been made for all necessary amenities on as ample a scale as possible, consistently with the local conditions, limitations of the site and the cost. The layout of the Terminal Building has been shown to and discussed with the shipping interests operating passenger liners, who have generally approved it. It is expected that the amenities proposed to be provided at the Passenger Terminal will meet the requirements of the passenger traffic at this Port in the foreseeable future and also compare well with other international passenger terminals.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, 12-12-1966*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 4, para 23)

The Committee are glad to note that the total number of ship-days lost for general cargo ships which had risen to 3844 in 1964-65 has come down to 2089 in 1965-66 and that similarly the number of shipdays lost for foodgrains ships in 1965-66 has come down by nearly 50 per cent i.e., *from 1082 in 1964-65 to 545 in 1965-66. The Committee would like the port authorities to intensify their efforts so as to achieve a still better turn-round of ships as it has an intimate impact not only on the detention money paid but also indirectly on the freight charges levied by the Conference Lines. This has also an impact on our critical foreign exchange position as almost the entire extra charges for detention of ships have to be paid in foreign exchange.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

In regard to the necessity to reduce shipdays lost by foodgrain ships, it may be pointed out that by a proper co-ordination of the various operations connected with the discharge, bagging and clearance of foodgrains and effective supervision by the Regional Director (Food) over the personnel engaged for this purpose, it is possible for the Ministry of Food (Regional Director of Food) to improve both the rates of discharge of foodgrains as well as their clearance. The Bombay Port Trust has appointed a Working Group which meets every week and on which are represented, representatives of Shipping Interests, Unions of labourers handling foodgrain, the Regional Director (Food), the Trunk Railways and Bombay Port

Trust officials. The operation of discharge and clearance of food-grains in the previous week is reviewed at each meeting and a close scrutiny is made of the reasons for failures at any point, in order to ensure that timly action is taken to rectify any shortcomings noticed.

Similarly, in regard to reducing the number of shipdays lost by general cargo, vessels the working of the Docks as a whole is under constant review by the Port Working Committee as well as by its Advisory Panel which meets once every month and frequently, if necessary. Every effort is being made and will continue to be made to ensure not only quick despatch for vessels at berths, but also to ensure that vessels arriving in Port for cargo operations are allotted to a berth with the least possible detention.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 5, Para 33)

The Committee are constrained to observe that the shortfall in Plan expenditure which was Rs. 4.5 crores (29 per cent) during the First Plan period rose to Rs. 20.2 crores (81 per cent) in the Second Plan period. The main reason for this shortfall in the planned expenditure was the failure of the port authorities and Government to take a firm decision about the developmental schemes for the port with the result that during the first two plan periods no concrete steps were taken to increase the much needed berthing capacity in Bombay Port. It was only in 1962, the second year of the Third Plan, that Dock Expansion Scheme was finalised and credit from I.D.A. was arranged.

The Committee are unhappy that the port authorities and Government have taken as many as two years to call for global tenders and place orders for the execution of the Dock Expansion Scheme, 1962. The leisurely manner of dealing with the matter show that the port authorities and Government were not actuated by any urgent desire to undertake timely execution of the Plan Scheme. The net result is that the Dock Expansion Scheme has commenced in right earnest only in the last year (1965-66) of the Third Five Year Plan and it is therefore, no wonder that there would again be a shortfall to the extent of Rs. 8.04 crores (31 per cent) during the Third Plan period. The Dock Expansion Scheme is now expected to be completed by 1969-70, that is almost towards the end of the Fourth Plan period, and for all these years the much-needed berthing capacity would remain short of requirements.

The Committee would like Government to undertake a study of the inordinate delay which has taken place in the implementation of the Dock Development Scheme so as to draw lessons for future and take remedial measures such as advance planning, tying up in advance arrangements for foreign aid, streamlining of the procedure for calling global tenders and placing of orders so that the Plan schemes are implemented as per scheduled programme.

Reply of Government

The Committee's observations have been noted for guidance and compliance in future.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966].

Further Information Called for by the Committee

Please indicate precisely the action taken on para 3 of the recommendation.

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No. 4/22(1)/ECI/65, dated* 28-7-1967.]

Further Reply of the Government

The circumstances leading to the delay in the implementation of the Dock Expansion Scheme have been explained in the notes submitted to the Estimates Committee and are set out in paragraphs 30 and 68 of the Estimates Committee's Report, Part I.

So far as the 4th Five Year Plan is concerned, action had already been initiated to implement the major projects included in the Plan, after conducting the necessary feasibility and economic studies. The scheme for the construction of an auxiliary dock system at Haldia has been taken up for execution making maximum use of indigenous potential and restricting imports to the minimum. The project is expected to be completed by January 1971. The Dock Expansion scheme at Bombay is progressing and is expected to be completed by June 1970. The Master Plan for the future development of the port is under preparation by the Port Trust's Consultants and it is expected to be ready by May 1968. The Madras Outer Harbour project has been taken up in right earnest. The project consists of two parts—the Oil Dock portion and the portion relating to ore handling facilities. The oil dock portion of the project has already made considerable progress. The project is expected to be completed

by the end of 1968 to synchronise with the commissioning of the Madras oil refinery. So far as provision of ore handling facilities are concerned, special consultants have been engaged to study the problem and to prepare a project report, designs and the estimate for the provision of these facilities. As soon as the Consultants' report is available, the scheme relating to the provision of ore handling facilities will be taken up and necessary arrangements will be made to tie up the necessary resources. At Visakhapatnam, the major scheme included in the Fourth Plan is the Additional Four Berth Scheme and the installation of a modern iron ore handling plant. The Four Berth Scheme is nearing completion; two ore berths and one general cargo berth have already been completed and another general cargo berth will be completed by the end of 1967. An iron ore handling plant has already been installed. The question of setting up the facilities at Visakhapatnam Port so as to increase its ore exporting potential is under study. Steps are being taken to procure essential items of floating craft and equipment against *ad hoc* credits. The port authorities have also been asked to make an assessment of the craft and equipment requirements during the next two years so that arrangements could be made to get them manufactured indigenously as far as possible.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1966.*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Para 33)

The Committee would like to draw pointed attention to the shortfalls under the heading of dredging of main harbour channel. A provision of Rs. 5 crores and Rs. 4 crores was made in the Second and Third Five Year Plans for capital dredging but the expenditure incurred was only Rs. 0.1 crore and Rs. 2.86 crores respectively. These shortfalls are particularly unfortunate as these must have adversely affected the operational efficiency of Bombay Port. The Committee hope that necessary steps would be taken to ensure that the harbour channels are kept properly and efficiently dredged.

The Committee find that the provision made for Ballard Pier in the Second Plan for Rs. 0:47 crore and under the Third Plan for Rs. 3·25 crores has been utilised only to the extent of Rs. 0·89 crore due to prolonged and inconclusive discussions with the Navy. The Committee consider that the Port Trust authorities and Government should have finalised arrangements for extension of Ballard Pier with greater urgency as these facilities were badly required to augment amenities in order to attract passenger and tourist traffic.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's observations have been noted. The Ballard Pier Extension Scheme is in progress and every effect will be made to complete it expeditiously.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate what positive steps have been taken to keep the harbour channel properly and efficiently dredged:

[*L.S.S. O.M. No.* 4/22(1)/*ECI*/65, *dated* 28-7-1967.]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The dredging of the main harbour channel at Bombay is being executed in Phases. It consists of the following three parts –Phase I—Middle Section of the Channel, Phase II—Northern Section of the Channel and Phase III—Southern Section of the Channel. Phase I and II have already been completed through contract dredging in 1963. The Port Trust propose to undertake Phase III departmentally with their own dredger. An estimate amounting to Rs. 33.61 lakhs has been sanctioned for the purpose.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 19-8-1967.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 7, Para 33)

The Committee would urge that necessary investigations about the new schemes, included in the Fourth Plan, should be taken in hand and blueprints prepared in good time so that the execution thereof can be undertaken as per scheduled programme. As regards the continuing schemes the Committee would like Government to review the factors which have hampered progress in the past and to devise necessary measures to complete the schemes without delay.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's observations have been noted for compliance. Every effort is being made to complete the projects expeditiously.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the recommendations of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1)/ECI/65, dated 28-7-1967.*]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

As regards new schemes included in the Fourth Five Year Plan, investigations and preparation of designs and drawings have been taken in hand in respect of many of the items. A Master Plan for the future development of the Port is at present under preparation by the Consultants of the Port. It is expected to be ready by May, 1968. This will form the Blue-Print for the future development of Bombay Port. The development of a satellite port at Nhava-Sheva on the eastern side of the harbour forms part of this study. In the meantime, action has been taken already by the Port Trust to complete the preliminaries relating to the project such as land, acquisition, preparation of a project report etc.

As regards continuing schemes, orders for most of the major items have already been placed and no difficulty is envisaged in completing them within the Fourth Plan period.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated 19-8-1967.*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 8, Para 34)

The Committee hope that the Design Cell would be suitably manned so that it can undertake all work relating to the preparation of detailed project reports, and designs and specifications in respect of the scheme to be executed by the port authorities in future.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Every effort will be made to man the Design Cell suitably so that it can undertake progressively the preparation of project reports, designs and specifications of the major development schemes.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated 12-12-1966.*]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No.* 4/22(1)/*ECI*/67, *dated* 28-7-1967.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Pending receipt of the report of the Consulting Engineers on the Master Plan for the future development of this Port, which is expected in May 1968 it is not possible to take up the work of detailed planning and drawing up of project reports of any of the major port in Sheva/Nhava area or the dry docks which are also likely to be located in that area. For the present, therefore, the planning cell is engaged on the preparation of designs, drawings, estimates and tender documents for some of the minor schemes included in the Fourth Five Five Year Plan, which are not likely to be affected by the Master Plan recommendations. These include the provision of slipways at Lakri Bunder, Deepening of the Frere Basin and Development of the Powder Works Bunder. For attending to this work the Cell has been strengthened on the design side by the addition of one Junior Executive Engineer, Design (formerly designated as Assistant Officer-in-Charge, Design) and one Draftsman, 2nd grade. The strength of the Cell is, therefore, now as under:—

Superintending Engineer (formerly designated as Executive Engineer)	1
Jr. Executive Engineer (formerly Jr. Assistant Engineer)	1
Jr. Executive Engineer, 'Design' (formerly Assistant Officer-in-Charge, 'Design')	1
Assistan Executive Engineer (formerly Sub-Engineer)	1
Draftsman, II Grade	1

The preliminary investigations in respect of the Scheme, the design and planning work of which has been put in hand, having been completed, the Marine Survey Staff has been discontinued.

The Design Cell, as staffed at present, is considered adequate to carry out the work in hand. The Cell will be suitably augmented further when it becomes possible to entrust it with further work after the Master Plan Report is received.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation* (*Transport Wing*), *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI*(36)/66, *dated* 10-11-1967.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 9, Para 53)

The Committee are distressed to note that the Minimum Scheme which was conceived in 1949, drawn up in 1951, should have been dragged on for eleven long years till 1959 when it was finally abandoned. In the meantime its estimated cost had risen from Rs. 4.30 crores to Rs. 20.00 crores. The Committee consider that the non-implementation of this Scheme has resulted not only in infructuous labour and expenditure which was incurred on its preparation and subsequent processing but has also hampered the efficiency of the Port by delaying the development of the Bombay Port for over a decade.

The Committee are unable to appreciate the insistence of the Trustees to get a grant from Government to cover fifty percent of the cost of the Scheme, when there was no precedent for giving such grants to any other port and when the port's own financial position was sound enough to undertake the scheme. It is really surprising that the Trustees did not even avail of the loan assistance of Rs. 4.17 crores, offered by Government in 1953, towards the cost of the schemes included in the First Five Year Plan which covered the Minimum Scheme also. Even after the Minister of Transport in 1959 had advised the deputation of the Trustees to re-examine the scheme and to put up a phased programme of development of the port, the Trustees insisted on proceeding with their original scheme and included it in their draft Third Five Year Plan. All this indicates that the Minimum Scheme had been turned into a prestige issue by the then Trustees which, the Committee consider to be a very unhealthy trend in the Port Trust. This apprehension of the Committee is confirmed by the change in the attitude of Trustees and their willingness to prepare another scheme in June, 1959, when a new incumbent had taken over as Chairman of the Port Trust.

The Committee are surprised at the apparent helplessness of Government to issue necessary directions to the Port Trust to proceed with the development scheme on the lines indicated by them. They are not convinced by the plea taken by the representatives of the Ministry that they did not have powers of issuing directions under the Bombay Port Trust Act, 1879, which lacuna the Government could have and should have filled up any time by necessary legislative measure, rather allow the development of one of the most important ports to be stayed indefinitely due to the undesirable attitude of the Port Trust. This is all the more surprising as under the Major Port Trust Act, 1963, Government have already armed themselves with power of issuing directions to all major ports, which are brought

under the purview of the Act. The Committee also note that Government had available to them the powers under Section 90 of Bombay Port Trust Act, 1879, to supersede the Board. The Committee suggest that Government should review the position in the light of the experience and take suitable measures to ensure that they have adequate powers of issuing directions to the Bombay, Calcutta and Madras Port Trust authorities in the overall interest of national economy as also in the interest of the development of the Ports.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

It is proposed to undertake legislation to amend the Port Acts of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras when the question of Government having adequate powers of issuing directions to the Port Trusts on the lines of the powers already available to Government under the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963, will be considered.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 25-8-1967.*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 10, Para 59)

The Committee consider that with the experience of the Minimum Scheme and the data and technical advice already available with the Port authorities and the fact that the development of the port had been unnecessarily delayed already by a decade, the Port Trust should have taken adequate care, and should have been in a position to draw up a "well thought out" revised plan for the development of facilities at Bombay Port. The Committee regret that the Modernisation Scheme which was approved by Port Trust authorities in 1959, had also to be abandoned in 1962 due to technical shortcomings.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's observations have been noted for future guidance.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1966.*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 11, Para 68)

The Committee are concerned to note that the Dock Expansion Scheme which is stated to be a truncated version of the earlier abonddoned scheme, viz. Modernisation Scheme, and was approved by Government in June 1962 will now be executed by the middle of 1969

and with all ancillary works by 1970 instead of April 1968, as originally envisaged. The Committee cannot help regretting the delay of about two years at such a crucial time when additional dock facilities are urgently needed to relieve congestion in the port. The Committee consider that most of these delays which are mainly due to lack of administrative and procedural clarifications, could have been avoided if the Dock Expansion Scheme had been pursued from the very beginning with a sense of urgency.

The Committee also note that the cost of the project has risen from Rs. 10.92 crores to Rs. 13.25 crores representing an increase of 21 per cent over the original estimate.

The Committee are surprised to note that the economics of the Port Development Scheme had not been worked out in detail by the Port authorities. It appears that Government also did not insist on this basic data at the time of approving the scheme. The Committee recommend that whatever be the other justifications, the financial implications of development schemes together with their revenue earning potential should be worked out in detail in the very beginning so as to enable the Port authorities to carefully examine the effect of the estimated outlay on the port charges and the overall financial position of the port. The working out of these details would also prove helpful in controlling costs and exercising economy. The Committee are glad to note that all preliminaries have been finalised and that the work is gaining momentum. They would like the Port authorities to ensure that the Dock Expansion Scheme is completed by 1969-70.

Reply of Government

The Committee's recommendation that, whatever the other justifications, the financial implications of development schemes together with their revenue earning potential should be worked out in detail at the very beginning is noted for future guidance.

Every effort is being made to ensure that the Dock Expansion Scheme is completed by 1969-70.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 12, Para 69)

The Committee hope that consistent with the necessity of maintaining efficiency, the strength of the Engineering Department as also other Departments of the Port Trust which are associated with the

execution of the Dock Expansion Scheme, will be kept to the minimum level necessary and that utmost economy would be effected in the expenditure on the project at far as possible.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's suggestion has been noted for compliance. In fact, every effort is being made to effect economy.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation* (*Transport Wing*), *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No.* 4/22(1)/*ECI*/65, *dated* 28-7-1967.]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

In drawing up the staff requirements for strengthening the Engineering Department to deal with the Project of Dock Expansion Scheme and other major projects covered under the IDA Credit, due consideration was given to the work-load in the course of the anticipated progress at different stages, and the requirements were divided into three phases. These requirements are further reviewed in the light of actual progress made and the tempo of the work attained, at the beginning of each phase and sanction is obtained only to such strength of staff at different levels as is warranted for the efficient and proper execution of the works envisaged in the particular phase. Furthermore, even in the actual operation of the sanctioned posts and the period of their operation in any phase, due consideration is given to the actual needs. As a result of this procedure, the following posts were not operated for the periods mentioned against each:—

Phase II—Period: 27-3-63 *to* 31-12-64:

		From	*To*
1	Addl. Chief Engineer	27-3-63	1-10-1963
2	Dy. Chief Engineers	-do-	27-9-1963
1	Superintending Engineer (Designs)	27-3-1963	12-1-1964
1	Sr. Executive Engineer	-do-	27-9-1963
1	Jr. Executive Engineer	-do-	16-3-1964

		From	to
1	Asstt. Executive Engineer (Design)	2-3-1963	7-7-1963
1	Asstt. Executive Engineer (Designs)	-do-	8-3-1964
2	Asstt. Executive Engineers	-do-	31-12-1964

Phase III Period 1-1-1965 to 30-6-66 :

1	Superintending Engineer	1-1-1965	30-6-1966

Phase IV Period 1-7-66 to 31-3-68 :

1	Superintending Engineer	1-7-66	Upto now
1	Sr. Executive Engineer	1-7-66	-do-
1	Asstt. Executive Engineer	1-7-66	-do-

2. On account of the devaluation of the Rupee effective from 6-6-1966 and increased cost of living, it was found necessary to increase the salaries of the expatriate personnel appointed on the Consulting Engineering establishment for site supervision of the works. With a view to offsetting this increase in cost on the salaries of the expatriates, the number of expatriates has been reduced from 8 as originally envisaged to 5.

3. It will thus be seen that due care is taken to effect economy and to keep down the engineering staff to the minimum consistent with efficiency.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66 dated* 10-11-1967].

Recommendation (S. No. 13 Para No. 73)

The Committee are unhappy that a period of 5 years has been taken after the dismantling of old Rim Bascule Bridge to replace it by a modern structure. The Committee feel that the Port Trust authorities should have undertaken advanced planning and designing of the new bridge, in consultation with the Defence and Railway authorities, so that orders could have been placed for the fabrication of the bridge well before the old bridge was dismantled. They are also unhappy that there was delay of twenty-one months in the execution of foundational works for the bridge and that a period of one year was taken to modify the design of the bridge in order to fit in the naval requirements. All these delays have resulted in substantially increasing the cost of the bridge and also adversely affected the traffic of trucks and other vehicles. The Committee would stress the need for advanced planning, designing and timely execution in the interest of efficiency and economic execution of works.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The recommendation made by the Committee regarding the need for advance planning, designing and timely execution, in the interest of efficiency and economic execution of works, has been noted for future guidance.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36) /66 dated* 19-5-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 14 Para 80)

The Committee note that the Master Plan envisaged for the Bombay Port will provide for the long-term development of the Port taking into consideration the interests of users of the port and harbour and probable development of the port traffic during the next 50 years. Bombay is a premier Port of India and has a highly developed hinterland with exportable surplus agricultural products. A number of engineering and cotton industries have been set up in its vicinity and the bulk commodities like foodgrains and industrial goods are mostly imported through this port. This port will, therefore, continue to play important part in the nation's economy. It is therefore of paramount importance that the Master Plan for development of this port should be drawn up keeping in view the following considerations among other things so that no infructuous capacity is created in any port.

(i) *the immediate needs of the port traffic;*

(ii) *the long term needs of the country specially of the adjoining areas; and*

(iii) *the development of facilities in other ports on the western coast—major intermediate and minor.*

The Committee further suggest that a study should be made to find out if any decentralisation and diversion of traffic from Bombay to other ports is possible as that would not only help in relieving congestion of traffic in Bombay Port but would also assist in the development of other areas adjoining the ports and in reducing the load on rail/road traffic.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

In connection with the preparation of the Master Plan, an extensive programme of economic investigation has been undertaken by the Directorate of Transport Research, Ministry of Transport. The studies are aimed at projecting the economic development, over a period of the next 50 years, of the country in general, and of the

Bombay region in particular, to determine the economic hinterland of the Port of Bombay and to forecast the nature and volume of traffic in different commodities that may be required to be handled at this Port. The studies will be sufficiently detailed to give an indication of the immediate as well as of the long term needs of the Port traffic. They will also take into account the projected and likely development of facilities in other ports on the West Coast which are likely to influence the traffic at Bombay. The three points referred to by the Committee will be covered in the economic studies on which the Master Plan will be based.

The suggestion for carrying out a study regarding the possibility of decentralisation and diversion of traffic from Bombay to other ports, will be kept in view in connection with the studies relating to the preparation of the Master Plan for development of Bombay Port.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36) /66, *dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 15 Para 80)

The Committee would like the Consultants to be given a specific instruction to ensure the maximum utilisation of structures and equipments from indigenous sources so as to affect maximum economy in foreign exchange.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's suggestion has been noted. Necessary instructions in this regard have been issued to the Consultants.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36) /66, *dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 16 Para 80)

The Committee would suggest that before the Master Plan is finalised, its draft should be given wide publicity among the trade and industry and shipping concerns, and other ports users with a view to elicit their suggestions.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Consulting Engineers will hold discussions with and ascertain the views of the principal users of the Port in evolving the Master Plan. It is, therefore, felt that giving publicity to the Plan in its draft form may not be necessary as it may delay the finalisation of the report. After the report is received from the Consulting Engineers, it could be circulated to all the interests concerned

for their comments, which could be duly considered before any part of the Master Plan is taken up for execution.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 17, Para No. 80)

The Committee would like to suggest that to avoid duplication of port facilities and to ensure their rationalisation and economic utilisation, the Master Plan for the development of a particular port should form part of the overall planned programme for the long term development of all the ports both on regional basis and on national basis. Such a development programme has necessarily to take into account, among others, the long term forecast of:—

(i) *the volume of the country's present foreign trade both imports and exports and the proposed or expected increase in 2 or 3 subsequent Plan periods.*

(ii) *changes in the pattern of trade;*

(iii) *the size of future ships and the developments in the shipbuilding industry,*

(iv) *agricultural and industrial production and consumption in the various regions within the country,*

(v) *internal traffic arrangements, both rail and road, from and to the ports.*

For this purpose, detailed statistics in respect of each of these matters will require to be collected and reviewed. The Committee suggest that the collection of basic statistics and the preparation of overall integrated development plan for the ports may be undertaken centrally by the Government in consultation with National Harbour Board, Planning Commission, the Port Trusts, representatives of trade and industry etc.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's recommendations have been noted. In formulating the Fourth Five Year Plan for the development of major ports, the various considerations mentioned by the Estimates Committee have been kept in view. Further, the Port authorities have been asked to prepare perspective plans covering the requirements of 10 to 15 years taking a long range view of the possible developments in the various sectors of the national economy.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-M. 12-PDI (936)/66 dated* 19-5-1967.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee had suggested that "the collection of basic statistics and the preparation of overall integrated development plans for the port may be undertaken centrally by the Government in consultation with the National Harbour Board etc."

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the above suggestion of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1)/ECI/65, dated 28-7-1967.*]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Committee's recommendations were fully kept in view in formulating the Fourth Five Year Plan programmes for major ports. In November 1963, a Working Group consisting of the representatives of the various Ministries was set up to draw up the plans. After preliminary discussions with the major port authorities, it was considered desirable to indicate certain guide lines on the basis of which the ports could prepare their plans for examination by the working Group. The guide lines *inter-alia* stipulated that the plan should be broadly related to the anticipated traffic in respect of important commodities over the next ten years. The proposals formulated by the major ports were examined by the Working Group in detail. To get an idea of the future pattern of traffic in bulk commodities such as oil, fertiliser, iron and steel, the Working Group held discussions with the Ministries concerned. The Port authorities were asked to revise their plan proposals in the light of these discussions. The Fourth Plan programme for major ports that emerged as a result of this review was discussed in detail in the Planning Commission and included in the Draft Outline of the Fourth Five Year Plan.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI('36)/66 dated* 19-8-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 18, Para 31)

The Committee commend the decision of Government to entrust the work of economic and traffic investigations for the Master Plan of the Bombay Port to the Director, Transport Research, in the Ministry of Transport. They hope that in conducting these investigations the Planning and Research Cell of the port would be fully associated so that the Cell may gain, in due course, sufficient experience in dealing with the problems of the port independently.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Planning and Research Cell of this Port has been associated from the start with the economic investigations entrusted to the Di-

rector of Transport Research. As a result of discussions held with the Director, the Port Trust Cell is at present engaged in the following studies:—

(1) A preliminary study of the existing trade pattern of the Bombay Port, both foreign and coastal, and its share in the national total; and

(2) A study of the origin and destination of the principal commodities passing through the Bombay Port, in order to demarcate the economic hinterland of the port.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI (36) /66, dated* 6-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 19, Para 81)

The Committee would suggest that the Directorate of Transport Research should arrange to impart, in due course, instructions to Planning and Research Cells of major ports in the country so that they are fully trained in the work of collection and collection of various statistics required for drawing up traffic projections for future development of ports.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI (36) /66, dated* 22-11-1967.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22 (1) /ECI/67, dated* 28-7-1967.]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Planning and Research Cells at the ports are already collaborating with the Directorate of Transport Research in the preparation of traffic projections and collection of economic data concerning their respective ports to formulate plans for their future development. The port authorities have generally welcomed the idea of the Directorate of Transport Research imparting training to the staff of the Planning and Research Cells at the ports. The steps to be taken for the implementation of the recommendation are proposed

to be considered by the port authorities at a meeting to be convened shortly.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI (936)/66, dated* 10-11-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 20, Para 85)

The Committee are glad that the port authorities have taken the initiative to get prepared interim plan for the development of Nhava-Sheva, pending the completion of detailed Master Plan. The Committee would like Government to take an early decision about the development of four berths for handling foodgrains at Nhava-Sheva, keeping in view the requirements of the country during the next 20-25 years, the capacity available in Bombay Port and other neighbouring ports and the traffic projections for imports and exports from the hinterland. The Committee would like Bombay Port Trust authorities to maintain effective liaison with the State Government of Maharashtra and the Ministries of Food, Transport and Railways so as to ensure an early integrated development of the proposed satelite port of Nhava-Sheva.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The scheme relating to the development of port facilities at Nhava-Sheva has been included in the Fourth Five Year Plan programme of Bombay Port. A provision of Rs. 6 crores has been included in the Plan for this scheme. Necessary investigations in regard to the project are underway and action has been initiated for the preparation of a project report for the scheme.

In connection with the Master Plan for the development of the Port of Bombay, detailed economic studies have been taken in hand with a view to assessing the type and quantum of traffic that this Port may be called upon to handle during the next 50 years. The study will take into account, *inter alia*, the possible development of other ports and the effect thereof on the economic hinterland of the Port of Bombay. The findings of the study will be given due consideration in deciding on the capacity of the additional port facilities in the Sheva-Nhava area. In working out the details of the scheme, effective liaison will be maintained with the Government of Maharashtra and the Ministries of Food, Transport and Railways.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI (936)/66, dated* 27-1-1967.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 23, Para 88)

The Committee are distressed to note that the Bombay Port Trust has all along been depending on the foreign firm of Consulting Engineers even after eighteen years of Independence. Similar position appears to exist in other major ports in the country. Apart from the outgo of precious foreign exchange which in the case of Bombay alone, amounted to £ 398,326, the employment of foreign consultants may lead to excessive purchases of plant and machinery from the consultants own country as the designs and specifications prepared by them naturally tend to take into account the developments in their own country. In fact the Chairman, Bombay Port Trust admitted during evidence that "this is the price we have to pay for not being able to have our own indigenous engineers". The Committee have already recommended in para 37 of their Ninety-second Report on Mormugao Port that effective action should be taken to establish inter port technical consultancy service in the country for the Fourth Plan. The Committee hope that determined steps would be taken to make a beginning in providing indigenous consultancy service to the ports without further delay.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's observations have been noted for compliance.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (936)/66, dated 12-12-1966*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 24, Para No. 90)

The Committee are concerned to note that there is occasional loss of depth at some of the berths when either the berth is not available for dredging or the dredgers are not available for the work, with the result that sometimes a berth found to silt has to be allocated to vessels of lower drafts. The Committee feel that such a state of affairs not only causes difficulties in allocation of right berth for the right draft but is also bound to affect adversely the turn-down of vessels.

The Committee are glad to note that for improving drafts at Alexandra Dock, it is proposed to impound water to an extra height of 4 feet so that ships drawing upto 34 feet can use the docks as against 30 feet under normal conditions. While welcoming this measure, the Committee urge that concerted efforts should be made to keep the approach channels and berths clear of siltation in order to

allow entry of ships with requisite drafts for the maximum period possible.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The fact that the present high rate of berth occupancy retards timely dredging of the berth was one of the reasons for undertaking the Dock Expansion Scheme. When there is heavy pressure on the available berthing capacity, it is extremely difficult to spare berths for dredging without causing loss of valuable ship days to vessels waiting for berths. When the Dock Expansion Scheme is completed, it is expected that a margin of reserve capacity will be available for releasing dock berths for timely dredging.

The Committee's desire that every effort should be made to keep the approach channels and berths free of siltation is noted. Such an effort is in fact being made even now.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated* 19-5-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 25, Para 90)

The Committee note that at present figures of ship-days lost due to dredging operation being carried on the berths are not being recorded. The Committee suggest that a record of these figures may also be kept separately as it will enable better control over dredging of berths by the port authorities.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's suggestion has been noted and is being implemented.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No. 12-PDI(936)/66, dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 29, Para 98)

The Committee are glad to note that to provide for massive food imports in the coming months, Government have earmarked the quantities of foodgrains to be handled monthly at the various ports. It will, however, be seen that Bombay Port will be required to handle the largest quantity (i.e. 3.7 lakhs tonnes per month). This would naturally place a great train on the deep berthing capacity at the Alexandra Dock.

The Committee note the increase in the average rate of handling of foodgrain tankers at Bombay Port from 1500-2500 tons to 3000-3500

tons per day since the Government took over the responsibility from the shippers. To cater to the increased quantities of foodgrains to be handled in future, it is imperative that the discharge rate from bulk foodgrain carriers should be further increased. The Committee urge that Government should make concerted efforts to achieve the maximum rate of discharge by judicious use of modern machinery/equipment and speedy clearance of foodgrains so as to achieve optimum utilisation of the berths.

The question of providing a belt conveyor to speed up movement of foodgrains should be examined early.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Berths Nos. 7, 9 and 12 Alexandra Dock, have been specially equipped by the Ministry of Food for the speedy discharge of foodgrains. At these berths 28 Buhler Machines, each with a discharging capacity of 30 tons an hour, are used for discharging wheat into the hoppers placed inside the Sheds. Two Buhler machines are kept as spare, Shed No. 8, Alexandra Dock, is also used as an auxiliary shed for the tankers berthed at Nos. 7 and 9, Alexandra Dock, from where the grain is discharged into Shed No. 8 by a belt conveyor.

In addition to the Buhler machines, the Ministry of Food has also acquired 31 grain discharging machines, similar to Buhlers, known as Vac-U-Vators, which are mainly used for discharged milo. The rated capacity of these machines is 15 tons an hour when used for discharging wheat and 12 tons an hour when used for discharging milo.

Bagged rice is handled at any berth that may be available, by using shore cranes or ships derricks.

One berth in the Prince's and Victoria Docks is used for discharging grains lightered from tankers.

The clearance of foodgrains from the Docks is the responsibility of the Regional Director (Food), Ministry of Food. His requirements of railway wagons for the transportation of foodgrains meant for upcountry destinations is being met in full by us.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36) /66, dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 30, Para 98)

As Bombay Port is susceptible to heavy monsoon and as there is no silo for storing foodgrains there, Government may also examine

the feasibility of providing quickly erectable rain shelters to make for uninterrupted handling of foodgrain operations.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

At the Port of Bombay, the discharge of foodgrains is effected by Buhler machines with chain and belt conveyors leading the grain to the hoppers—installed at the sheds. The Buhler machines are provided with canopies over them for protection against rain and the chain conveyors are fully enclosed. This is the arrangement at berth Nos. 7 and 9 Alexandra Dock, where the discharge of foodgrains is effected by the Food Ministry departmentally.

At berth No. 12, where the operation is carried out by contractors for the Ministry of Food, rain shelters have already been provided on the gallery where the grain is received and conveyed to the hoppers through horizontal conveyors.

The discharge of grain is thus not affected by rain.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36) /66, dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 31, Para 98)

The Committee would emphasise that co-ordinated arrangements should be made for expeditious movement of foodgrains from the port, to their destinations, cutting out all infructuous and unnecessary movement. The Committee would, therefore, recommend that as far as possible imported foodgrains for destinations outside Bombay, should be moved from quay side in rail wagons.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

In order that the clearance of foodgrains may be speeded up, the following suggestions made by the Working Group appointed by the Chairman of the Bombay Port Trust to regulate and improve the discharge and clearance of foodgrains have been implemented:—

(a) Manson Road, which runs parallel to the Frere Road, has been exclusively appropriate for the outward movement of foodgrains moving in lorries. Police patrol is maintained by day over this roadway to prevent other traffic encroaching upon it.

(b) Two points viz., the East Yard, Alexandra Dock, and the Mole Station, Ballard Pier, have been earmarked for the exclusive placement of wagons for despatch of foodgrains from the Docks.

In regard to the suggestions that imported foodgrains should be moved as far as possible from quayside in rail wagons, due to the limited rail facilities available at the Docks sidings it is not feasible to provide more than 150 wagons for movement of foodgrains at the Docks sidings. Nevertheless, facilities have been made available to enable placement of 180 wagons on sidings on the Port Trust estate, outside the Docks. In addition, 200 wagons are being made available by the Trunk Railways at Carnac and Wadi Buders and Byculla for loading of foodgrains landed at the Docks.

The attention of the Ministry of Food has been frequently drawn to the necessity of ensuring that the programme of foodgrains arrivals is staggered so as to prevent the accumulation of foodgrains vessels at the Port awaiting their turn for berths in the Docks and thus reducing, it not eliminating altogether the demurrage payable on these vessels.

[*Ministry of Transport & Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966]

Recommendation (Serial No. 32, Para 99)

The Committee are aware that due to recent drought conditions in the country, Government had to resort to large-scale imports of foodgrains. To meet the situation, the capacity of various ports had to be geared up. The Committee also understand that a team of American experts has recently visited the country to study the capacities of the ports to handle the imports of foodgrains. The Committee feel that with all the above data now available about the capabilities of the ports to handle the foodgrains, Government should be in a better position to decide as to what additional facilities are needed to handle imports of foodgrains in the coming years and how these imports can be dispersed region-wise among different ports.

The Committee would like to stress that as the creation of additional handling facilities is a costly and time-consuming process, these should be completed/expeditiously so as to be available in the present food emergency.

The Committee need hardly emphasise that when new berths are constructed, care should be taken to see that they are equipped with the latest handling devices and are capable of handling larger tankers and bulk carriers which are increasingly coming into use.

The Committee would also like to remind Government, that while creating additional foodgrains handling facilities in Indian Ports, they would take into consideration the fact that food emergency is not ex-

pected to continue after the present year and that imports of foodgrains are expected to slow down in every subsequent year with the success of the food production drive which has been undertaken in the country, till ultimately it is stopped when self-sufficiency in foodgrains is attained. They further expect that the additional handling facilities to be created during the present food crisis may be so designed and erected as to make them capable of handling other bulk cargoes with the easing of the food crisis.

Reply of Government

The Committee's observations have been noted for compliance.

[*Ministry of Transport & Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1966*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 33, Para 101)

The Committee are constrained to observe that although the need for the construction of a grain silo at Bombay Port was felt as early as 1960, it has so far not been installed. The Committee feel that for a Port like Bombay which has to handle more than 3 million tonnes of foodgrains annually, it is necessary that in addition to providing for quicker discharge of foodgrains from the ships, it should also be ensured that the foodgrains are regularly cleared from the berths every day to avoid congestion in the Port. This can be achieved by having a grain silo.

Now that the scheme of silo forms a part of the overall development of food-handling facilities in the satellite port at Nhava-Sheva, the Committee hope that Government will give due consideration to the size etc. of the silo which should be set up to meet the present and the future requirements. In this connection the Committee would like to emphasise that Government should profit from the experience of working of the silo at Calcutta Port so that the initial operating troubles encountered in Calcutta are obviated.

Reply of Government

The recommendation has been brought to the notice of Ministry of Food & Agriculture (Department of Food) for necessary action.

[*Ministry of Transport & Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 27-1-1967.*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 34, Para 103)

The Committee are of the opinion that the technical and economic feasibilities of the scheme offered by M/s Chowgule and Co. for hand-

ling foodgrains at Bombay Port should be gone into fully with particular reference to its cost and period of implementation by the Ministry of Transport in consultation with the Ministries of Food and Agriculture and Railways before taking a final decision in the matter.

Reply of Government

So far as the Bombay Port Trust is concerned, the technical feasibility of the scheme offered by M/s Chowgule & Company for lighter discharge of foodgrains from tankers has been carefully examined and the firm has been offered a length of the quay at Hay Bunder for positioning barges to discharge grain. A plot of land has also been offered to the firm a short distance away from the quay site for erecting a shed into which the grain could be conveyed by means of a belt conveyor from the barges. These sites have been approved by the firm in discussion with the Docks Manager. As regards the economic feasibility of the scheme, this can only be determined by the Ministry of Food on the basis of the terms quoted by M/s Chowgule and Co.

[*Ministry of Transport & Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966]

Further Information called for by the Committee

Please state the reaction of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture regarding the economic feasibility of the scheme offered by M/s Chowgule & Co. for handling foodgrains.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1)ECI/65, dated* 28-7-1967]

Further Reply of the Government

The Food Ministry had examined the scheme and have found it unworkable. Since the scheme was submitted by M/s Chowgule & Co. in November 1964, a number of discharging machines have been purchased by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and are in operation at Alexandra Docks, Bombay. In addition, chain conveyors and hoppers have been installed at Alexandra Dock No. 7 and Alexandra Dock No. 9. All these arrangements have made it possible to have a daily discharge/clearance rate of even upto 14000 to 15000 tonnes at Bombay Port on a single day. The Ministry of Food & Agriculture have also been receiving foodgrains in bigger tankers and in super tankers and have handled them without any difficulty. In the circum-

stances, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture considered hardly necessary to pursue the scheme submitted by M/s Chowgule & Co.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated 25-8-1967*).

Recommendation (Serial No. 35, Para 106)

The Committee regret to observe that the marine oil terminal scheme at Butcher Island was planned and executed without making detailed investigations about the future pattern of oil traffic, scope and quantum of works required and the rates for their execution. The result has been that the cost of scheme which was originally estimated by the Consultants at Rs. 4.49 crores in 1951, increased by 100 per cent to Rs. 9.83 crores in 1955 and to Rs. 10.25 crores in 1959, the total increase from the original estimates being about 110 per cent. Further, the execution and commissionning of the works were delayed and could not be synchronised with the commissioning of the oil refineries which necessitated the making of temporary arrangements for the supply of crude oil to the refineries at extra cost. What is more, the facilities provided under the scheme have also now proved to be inadequate within a short period of 8-9 years and some proposals are being contemplated for their improvement and development. The Committee recommend that the reasons for these shortcomings and inadequacies should be examined carefully by Government with a view to draw lessons while planning and executing port development schemes in future.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

As already pointed out in the notes furnished to the Estimates Committee, the block estimate of expenditure being required in a hurry, had to be framed on the basis of very rough information as to the facilities required to be provided and without detailed investigations, for which adequate time was not available. As no major port development work had been carried out, since 1914, the financial data on which the block estimate was prepared inadequate and resulted in the expenditure being under-estimated. However, the actual planning and designing of the Marine Oil Terminal was carried out by the Consulting Engineers after obtaining from the offices of the Oil Companies in London full particulars about the nature and scope of the requirements of facilities required and also after carrying out necessary investigations regarding soil conditions, hydraulic surveys and model studies, etc. The facilities were planned with due regard

to the requirements as could be foreseen at that time. It is mainly because of the fact that the traffic pattern has undergone an unexpected change during the last few years that difficulties are being experienced at the Marine Oil Terminal. The import of finished products was originally expected to be limited to only such grades as could not be manufactured in the Bombay Refineries. However, with the advent of the Indian Oil Corporation, large quantities of finished products, such as kerosene, petrol and high speed diesel oil, etc., are being imported, which are causing a bottleneck in the discharge, as the pipe capacity provided for the discharge of such products is small. Further, the necessity for flushing of the pipe-line while transferring different grades of finished products results in considerable loss of time. Because of these factors, the berth utilisation has increased to high percentage, thereby causing detention to tankers.

In 1952-53, when the Marine Oil Terminal was designed, a 30,000 d.w.t. tanker was considered as representative of the major component of the tanker fleet and likely to remain so in the foreseeable future. However, during the last ten years tanker operators have realised the economic advantages of using larger capacity tankers, particularly after the Suez Canal Dispute in 1956, and there has been a marked trend towards the use of larger tankers. It was because of these unexpected changes, which could not be foreseen at the time of designing the Marine Oil Terminal that the facilities are now found to be somewhat inadequate.

As regards the increase in the cost of the project over the initial block estimate, it has already been pointed out that the increase has arisen mainly because of the fact that the scope of the work as actually taken for execution, was considerably in excess of that envisaged in the block estimate and also because the rates adopted in the block estimate were found to be inadequate, there being no reliable guidance regarding the likely prices, since for over 40 years no major marine. structure work had been carried out at Bombay Port.

In planning and executing port development schemes, every effort will be made to forecast the future requirements to the maximum extent foreseeable and also to frame estimates on as realistic a basis as possible.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 36, Para No. 110)

The Committee attach a good deal of importance to the improvement of facilities for handling of oil traffic at Bomay and would like

the port authorities to take early decision about deepening the approach channel to Pir Pau Pier and the modifications to the fendering system so as to improve the berthing capacity of dolphins at the Butcher Island. If these schemes are found to be technically feasible and financially sound the Committee would like them to be implemented with expedition so that bigger tankers can be accommodated in the port as early as possible. The improvement in port facilities should also result in saving of detension charges which are being incurred on tankers for want of berthing capacity in the port.

Reply of Government

Considerable work has been done on the investigations, design and preliminary drawings for extending the Pir Pau Pier. It is, however, understood that the POL traffic in Bombay Port would fall substantially in the near future as the import and export of finished products would be very much reduced after the commissioning of the new oil refineries in the country. If this forecast comes true, there would be no justification for extending the Pir Pau Pier where only finished products are handled. It is, therefore, proposed to defer, for the time being, the proposal to make Pir Pau Pier suitable for the berthing of 18,000 DWT tankers.

The technical feasibility of improving the berthing capacity of the dolphins at Butcher Island by the application of second layer of rubber fenders at the outer face of the existing gravity fenders has been examined and a suitable design has been prepared. It is proposed to try the new arrangement of rubber fenders at one berth in the first instance and if found successful, to adopt it at the remaining two berths.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 19-5-1967*].

Recommendation (S. No. 37, Para No. 113)

The Committee are concerned to note that the port authorities have already awarded a contract for preliminary work of site investigation consisting of marine borings in connection with the construction of the over-bridge from Butcher Island to Trombay to carry pipe lines, without taking a final decision in the matter. Since the feasibility of carrying out repairs to the submarine pipe line quickly and satisfactorily has been indicated by the experts of oil Industries Team, the Committee recommend that the need for constructing the over-bridge which is estimated to cost Rs. 3.5 crores, may be examined carefully in consultation with technical experts.

Reply of Government

The site investigation for the proposed bridge between Trombay and Butcher Island was necessary in order to enable the preparation of a more accurate estimate for the construction of the bridge based on a design suitable to the site conditions. The relative merits of the two competing alternative *viz.* constructing the bridge or resorting to repairs to submarine pipelines, could better be compared on the basis of their likely costs. Not only the aspect relating to technical feasibility but also the cost aspect of carrying out repairs to submarine pipelines quickly and satisfactorily will be carefully considered. The pros and cons of both the alternatives will be properly weighed before taking a final decision in the matter.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 19-5-1967].

Further information called for by the Committee

Please indicate the final decision taken in the matter. . ..

[*L.S.S. O.M. No.* 4/22(1)*ECI*/65, *dated* 28-7-1967].

Further Reply of the Government

The Bombay Port Trust have observed as follows:—

Enquiries were made with a number of American firms specialising in lying sub-marine pipe lines regarding underwater survey pf our pipelines. Most of them offered to do the work by the conventional method of sending down divers. This would have involved heavy foreign exchange expenditure besides not being very reliable. Only one firm offered to do the work by a new method *viz.* by using a 'Linalog' instrument for recording erosion. This was possible only for pipelines of 12 inches diameter. Most of our pipelines are of 16 and 24 inches diameter as no suitable and reliable method of quick repairs seemed available, the proposal was dropped. The only alternative is construction of a bridge to carry pipelines from Butcher Island to trombay and laying new pipelines thereon. A provision of Rs. 10 lakhs for technical investigations for this scheme has been made in the Fourth Plan. Preliminary work for the preparation of the designs and tender documents for the technical investigations has been commenced and is in progress.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated,* 7-9-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 38, Para 116)

The Committee consider that as there is considerable margin of profit from the warehouses and godowns and as the Alexandra Docks are used by bigger ships, the conditions of these godowns and warehouses should be improved e.g. the floors of the warehouses and transit sheds should be improved, the hoists modernized and in general, action should be taken to arrange the goods on scientific lines so that these are easily accessible for identification and clearance.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

A phased programme for renewal repairs of floors of transit sheds and of warehouses in the Alexandra Dock has already been undertaken. The floors of most of the transit sheds have already been renovated wherever it was observed that due to wear and tear, they were uneven.

In regard to modernisation of the hoists it has been found that, several of the older transit sheds and warehouses in the Alexandra Dock are not structurally sound in that the timber piles, on which the sheds and warehouses rest, have sheared off. The proposal, therefore, is to demolish such sheds and warehouses and replace them with modern structures. It is proposed to take up two sheds at a time for demolition and reconstruction thereafter.

In regard to the suggestion that goods stored in sheds and warehouses be arranged on scientific lines, it may be mentioned that all goods stored in transit sheds and warehouses are stacked consignment-wise. However, consignees in the course of their search for their consignments and also in the course of effecting clearance, break down the stacks which often gives one the impression of disorderly staking of consignments.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966]

Recommendation (Serial No. 40, Para 123)

The Committee are concerned to note that 72,000 packages are lying uncleared by the customs due to disputes with the importers for duty or on the ground that the goods imported do not conform to the relative import licence etc.

The Committee would also like to point out that there is a general impression among the trade circles, shipping interests and even the port authorities that due to customs formalities goods are not cleared from the transit sheds as quickly as they should be. The Committee note that the Liaison Committee has been set up recently and learn that it is working quite actively of late at the port and that it provides a useful forum for the representatives of shipping agents and port authorities to meet the Deputy Collector of Customs. They hope that the Liaison Committee would help to dispel the impression referred to above that customs procedure are cumbersome, and time consuming. They suggest that the Liaison Committee should take effective steps to identify and remove the factors which hamper speedy clearance of goods so that remedial measures by way of rationalisation and simplification of procedures can be devised. In particular, the Committee would suggest that measures suggested in para 123 above should be carefully examined with a view to their early implementation.

Reply of Government

The need for expeditious clearance of the cargo lying uncleared at the Posts has been brought to the notice of the Ministry of Finance and they have issued instructions to the Customs officers at the Ports to render maximum possible assistance in this respect. The Customs Study Team set up by that Ministry have also since submitted their report on clearance of cargo. The Study Team have made recommendations aimed at expediting the clearance of cargo. These recommendations are under examination. It is hoped that this would result in a substantial improvement in the situation.

In this connection, reference is also invited to the Government's reply to Serial No. 41 of Appendix VIII to this Report.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing). O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 15-5-1967].

Further Information called for by the Committee

Please indicate the latest position regarding the number of Packages lying uncleared by the Customs, showing separately the number of packages out of 72,000 cleared so far.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1) ECI/65 dated* 28-7-1967]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Bombay Port Trust have stated as follows:—

The position of packages lying uncleared in the Docks and pertaining to the period 1960 to 1965 as on 18th August, 1967, was as follows:—

1960	Nil
1961	Nil
1962	8
1963	Nil
1964	22
1965	4575
TOTAL	4605

The rest of the pakages have since been disposed of by public auction and/or cleared by the parties from the docks.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 7-9-1967*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 42, Para 123)

The Comittee welcome the experiment of miniature custom-houses which have been set up in some sheds of the Bombay Port. They would like Government to assess carefully the achievements of this experiment in consultation with the trade and shipping agents and extend it to the remaining sheds and other ports.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The recommendation has been brought to the notice of the Ministry of Finance (Revenue Division) for necessary action.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 27-1-1967.*]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate the action taken by the Ministry of Finance in the matter.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No.* 4/22(1)*ECI*/65, *dated* 28-7-1967]

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) have stated as follows:—

The reference made by the Estimates Committee regarding setting up of miniature Custom Houses in the Sheds is, obviously, to the Dock Appraising Scheme, which was introduced in Bombay Port on an experimental basis on 16-8-65 in three continguous sheds in Alexandra Docks, and subsequently, encouraged by the results obtained in the three sheds, extended to three more sheds of the same Docks. The scheme was Introduced with a view to ensuring speedy clearance of cargo and better and closer Customs control over the goods. But, unfortunately, the facilities afforded under the Scheme are not being utilised to the fullest possibles extent by the Clearing Agents Importers with the result that the desired degree of success in speedy clearance of cargo have not been achieved. The Scheme is, however, still in the experimental stage and as such it is too early to assess its success.

The Collector of Customs, Bombay has been advised to continue giving a fair trial to the Scheme with such modifications as he, in consultation with the Customs Advisory Committee, may consider necessary to make this Scheme work successfully. Meanwhile, the Customs Study Team which has also devoted considerable thought to the problem of expeditious clearance of cargo at the Ports and has accepted the basic principle underlying the Dock Appraising Scheme of assessment and examination to be completed at a single point in the Docks, has suggested certain modifications, bearing in mind the difficulties that have come to light during the working of the Scheme. The recommendations of the Customs Study Team are under action. While implementing these recommendations, the Estimates Committee's observations in this behalf will also be borne in mind.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping* (*Transport Wing*), *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI*(36)/66, *dated* 10-11-1967.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 44, Para 123)

The Committee would commend the suggestion made by the Sundara Committee in September, 1965 that "in respect of Government

project cargoes which are imported on a large scale through the Port of Bombay, special arrangements should be made on a co-ordinated basis for the prompt clearance of such cargoes from the sheds and open spaces in the docks and for warehousing them or despatch to destination."

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's recommendation has been noted. As soon as consignments are landed, the Port Trust contact the project authorities, through their local agents, to ensure speedy clearance. All goods including project cargoes are transferred to warehouses from transit sheds on the expiry of the "free days" in order to release space in the transit sheds for fresh cargo.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 27-1-1967.*]

Recommendation (Serial No. 45, Para 124)

It is well known that heavy machinery which is imported at heavy cost of scarce foreign exchange is of great importance for the development of the country. The Committee cannot too strongly urge that every effort should be made for the proper storage of heavy machinery, particularly, the sensitive ones like scientific, electronic and electrical goods with a view to prevent them from damage due to exposure to rain.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's suggestion is noted for implementation.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1966*].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1)ECI/65, dated 28-7-1967*].

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Bombay Port Trust have observed as follows:—

We have paved two areas in the buffer sites at Hay and Haji Bunder to which we remove heavy goods lying undelivered in the

Alexndra Dock after the free days. Adequate watch and ward protection has been provided for cargoes lying at these sites including armed guard and packages are secured against weather damage by placing them on rickers and covering them with tarpaulins.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 7-9-1967*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 46, Para 125)

The Committee consider that goods which remain uncleared after the expiry of free days should be removed to uncleared warehouses. This would ensure that the operational area in the port is not cluttered with these uncleared goods. The Committee would, therefore recommend that early action should be taken to augment the warehousing accommodation for uncleared goods and that adequate arrangements should be made therein for proper stacking of goods to facilitate their eventual disposal.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The suggestions of the Committee have been noted. As the Committee has already observed, the Trustees of the Bombay Port have sanctioned the construction of two warehouses for the storage of uncleared goods, each of a floor area of 40,000 sq. ft. Each of these warehouses will have two floors. The Trustees have also sanctioned the requisite expenditure for enclosing the platforms of the Mole Station, Ballard Pier, thus providing an additional floor area of 28,560 sq. ft. to serve as a warehouse. The latter work has been completed and the warehouse has been taken into use in June 1966.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1967*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 48, Para 127)

The Committee are constrained to note the failure of the authorities to invoke till January, 1966 the provisions of Section 64A of the Bombay Port Trust Act, 1879, for the sale of goods by public auction when they have not been removed within one month of their receipt, although the Act was amended in 1949 to provide for this particular Section. The Committee consider that if action had been taken earlier in accordance with the provisions of Section 64A, it would have provided the much needed relief in easing the congested conditions in the transit sheds.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's recommendation has been noted for compliance. The Port Trust are now bringing up uncleared consignments for sale by public auction under the provisions of Section 64A of the Bombay Port Trust Act, 1879, in addition to these being auctioned under Section 64.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1966*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 49, Para 128) –

The Committee are distressed to note that in spite of large quantities of fish and fresh fruit handled at the port annually, the authorities have so far neglected to provide proper cold storage facilities for those perishable goods. They have no doubt that the provision of these facilities would attract more traffic of this kind to the port. They hope that this deficiency would be removed by providing necessary cold storage facilities under the Dock Expansion Scheme.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The necessity to provide cold storage facilities within the Port area, for storage of perishable cargoes, was realised several years ago but due to lack of suitable open area in the close vicinity of the berths in the Docks, the provision of this facility was deferred until the completion of the Dock Expansion Scheme. The two main items of perishable goods being shipped through the Docks are fresh fish and fruits. Even though we have not ourselves provided cold storage facilities for storage of these items, nevertheless, the Trustees have encouraged private effort to build cold storage plants by offering suitable land near the waterfront. For instance, the Trustees have leased the following areas, in the vicinity of Sessoon Dock, on which cold storage facilities for storage of fish have been provided by private enterprise:—

(1) An area of 29,277 sq. ft. on a 20-year lease,

(2) An area of 7,668 sq. ft. on a 20-year lease,

(3) An area of 3139 sq. yards on a 30-year lease,

An offer has also been made to the Maharashtra State Co-operative Marketing Society of a plot of land, admeasuring 320 sq. yards, at Victoria Dock, for the construction of cold storage facilities for storage of fresh fruit.

Should the necessity arise for extension of these facilities, it is proposed to provide them on the reclamation which will come into existence in 1968-69 after the completion of the Dock Expansion Scheme.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 50, Para 132)

The Committee are concerned to note that the number of out-turn reports indicating the quantum/number of packages discharged from ships which are given after three months continues to be quite large. Moreover, the reports given after more than one year have increased from 23 in 1961-62 to 74 in 1964-65. They appreciate that port authorities have taken some steps to reduce this period but greater efforts are still called for for bringing about the desired improvements in this regard. The Committee would suggest that the following measures be considered urgently in order to reduce the period of the out-turn reports to the minimum.

(i) *continuous endeavours should be made to improve the tally by implementing effectively the incentive scheme and by maintaining careful supervision;*

(ii) *prompt executive action should be taken in settling disputed items and in amending the out-turn report if a package is subsequently traced.*

(iii) *attempts should be made to segregate the cargo consignment-wise and to simultaneously warehouse the entire cargo of a ship which remains uncleared after the expiry of the free days.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The suggestions of the Committee have been noted and are being implemented.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966].

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLY.

Recommendation (Serial No. 26, Para 92)

The Committee note that under the existing dock by-laws, the vessels bringing import cargoes into the port are given preference over all other vessels waiting for berths. The Committee urge that in the light of experience gained, the port authorities should review the dock bye-laws keeping in view the changing priorities for handling of cargoes at Bombay Port e.g. foodgrains, exports etc.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's suggestion is noted.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please indicate precisely the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1)ECI/65, dated* 28-7-1967].

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Bombay Port Trust have observed as follows:—

Docks By-Law No. 7 provides for giving preference when allotting berths to vessels bringing import cargoes and berths are allotted to vessels in the order of their arrival. Docks By-Law No. 11 provides for over-ruling the order of precedence laid down by By-Law No. 7 in circumstances where better use of the docks and general interest of shipping will be served while By-Law No. 11-A provides that the trustees may give preference in allotment of berths to any vessel if in their opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest. At present priorities in berthing are being accorded to any vessel bringing a full load of foodgrains and to a vessel bringing a full load of Defence Cargoes.

Due to the lack of sufficient berths, we cannot extend priorities to vessels bringing other cargoes but even here requests for priority

berthing of vessels bringing cargoes other than foodgrains and Defence stores are judged on merits by the Trustees to whom the matter is referred when such request is received. A recent instance is the request received from the State Trading Corporation that vessels with a full cargo of vegetable oils imported for storage in the tank farm located in the Alexandra Dock be accorded priority in berthing which was accorded by the Trustees.

It may be noted that Conferences of Liner Vessels operate at the Port which, while appreciating the need for giving priority in berthing to vessels carrying Defence Stores and foodgrains, are averse to according priority for vessels carrying any other cargo.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 7-9-1967].

Recommendation (Serial No. 27, Para 93)

The Committee regret the dislocation and delays caused by the refusal of the Berthing Masters to take ships longer than 456 *feet into the Victoria Docks for about two years which aggravated the already acute congestion in the Bombay Port during that period. The Committee hope that with modern navigational aids, it should be possible to bring in larger vessels into the Victoria Docks in future.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The objection of the Berthing Masters to berth vessels longer than 456′ in the Victoria Dock was based on the navigational risks involved in turning and berthing such ships in the Dock. Although the maximum length of 480′ was previously indicated for the Victoria Dock, this was chiefly to accommodate the 'Amra' which was occasionally used for replacing the B.I. passenger ships in the Persian Gulf Service, in their preferential berth in Victoria Dock. During and after the last war, the longest ships generally berthed in this dock were the Liberties, which were 442 feet long. After the war ships were built longer as a regular feature and the Berthing Masters have since been protesting frequently on the grounds that the space is restricted in the Victoria Dock and large ships were specially difficult to handle. No navigational aids can overcome the physical restrictions on length and draft imposed by the available space in the Dock. The Berthing Masters have howeved since agreed to berth vessels longer than 450 feet in the Victoria Dock whenever this is necessary for relieving congestion or for any other special reasons.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing)*, *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI* (36)/66, *dated* 12-12-1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 28, Para 94)

The Committee expect that many of the present ills of Bombay Port regarding length and draft of the port would be resolved with the completion of the Dock Expansion Scheme which envisages the provision of deep water berths. They also hope that with the commissioning of additional berths under the proposed satellite port in Nhava-Sheva area, the position would further improve.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

With the completion of the Dock Expansion Scheme, four deep water berths will be added to the Alexandra Dock Basin and three medium draft berths along the harbour wall. With these additional berths, it is expected that there will be a substantial reduction in detention to shipping as seven ships, which cannot be accommodated in Princes and Victoria Docks on account of the length and draft restrictions, would then be able to find berths in the Alexandra Docks. The creation of additional facilities in the proposed satellite port in Nhava-Sheva area will further improve the position substantially particularly if the foodgrain and other bulk grain traffic is transferred to that site thereby releasing three or four berths in the general cargo berths.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 19-5-1967*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 41, Para 123)

The Committee would suggest that there should be periodical meetings at the level of the General Manager of the Port Trust and the Collector of Customs so as to review the overall position and remove all impediments coming in the way of speedy clearance of goods from the port premises.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

There is even now fairly close coordination between the Port and Customs authorities. The Collector of Customs is a member of the Port Trust Board and also of the Port Working Committee. His representative also attends the Anti-Pilferage Committee of the Port Trust, of which the Docks Manager is the Chairman. Similarly, the Port Trust is represented on the Bombay Customs House Advisory Committee and the Working Group.

Apart from the above, there are also periodical discussions on an *ad hoc* basis with Collector of Customs in regard to urgent cases

or subjects or whenever any senior officials of the Central Board of Customs and Excise visit Bombay. At such meetings all important pending items regarding Customs procedures are brought up.

In view of the above arrangements, it is not considered that further meetings between the Collector of Customs and the General Manager will be of any particular advantage, but the matter is being taken up with the Collector of Customs for arranging periodical meetings as and when sufficient items arise for discussion.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66 dated 6-12-1968*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 43, Para No. 123)

The Committee would suggest that the rates for letting out godowns in the port area which are understood to be lower than the rates prevailing in private godowns in the vicinity of the port area should be reviewed.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

In regard to the suggestion of the Committee that a review be made of the letting rates of godowns, this recommendation would not apply to the docks, warehouses and transit sheds since the transit sheds are not let out to any party for storage of his goods but are utilised for the reception of all goods in transit, irrespective of ownership. In regard to warehouses set apart for storage of uncleared goods these are merely meant for the reception of the over flow cargoes or cargoes landed into transit sheds but which are not cleared within a reasonable length of time following their landing. It is true that the Port Trust has let one warehouse jointly to an Association of traders in the oil seeds and oil trade and has also let two of its transit sheds at Frere Basin for the reception and storage of sugar consignments due for export through the port. These goods, due for shipment through the port, would normally have to be stored prior to shipment in the transit sheds but due to the fact that there was not sufficient accommodation to receive them at transit sheds it was decided to let out these sheds and warehouses for the advance storage of the consignments.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 19-5-1967*].

Recommendation (Serial No. 47, Para 126)

The Committee need hardly stress that clear marking on packages helps identification and facilitates delivery. The Committee

would suggest that Government should bring to the attention of all concerned viz., the importers, manufacturers, trade, shippers, ship-owners, the imperative need for secure packing and bold marking of packages to facilitate identification and quick delivery.

Reply of Government

The importance of secure packing and bold marking of packages is appreciated. It may, however, be stated that the difficulty in identification of the markings of the packages lying uncleared has arisen not due to failure on the part of the consignors of packages in providing secure packing for and distinct markings on the packages but mainly due to the fact that, through prolonged storage of these goods on the premises and the necessity to have them frequently transferred from one warehouse to another due to delayed clearance, the packing of the packages has suffered damage and the markings have been partially or, in some cases, wholly obliterated. Nevertheless, these packages have been listed and circularised to the Trade with a request that they should endeavour to identify them. Some of these packages have already been identified and cleared. Those which have not been identified have been listed for sale by public auction. It is possible that the examination and appraisal of their contents by the Customs prior to their sale and the circulation of these particulars to the Trade, might lead to the identification of some of them.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing) O.M. No. 12-PDI (36) /66, dated* 12-12-1966].

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Serial No. 21, Para 88)

The Committee are unable to appreciate fully the justification for the payment of annual retention fee of £1,000 to the Consulting Engineers for general consultancy work as they are to be paid separately for all special works and are reimbursed all expenditure incurred by them in connection with the port work. The Committee note that an appreciable number of engineers from the Port Trust Engineering Department are seconded to the Consulting Engineers. While the Committee appreciate in principle that the seconding of such officers may help them to get the requisite experience in port designing, they apprehended that such an arrangement is liable to create a vested interest and may come in the way of objective assessment of the work done by the Consultants particularly when the same consulting firm has been continuing for over twenty years.

Reply of Government

The retainer of £1,000/- per annum paid to the Consulting Engineers represents remuneration to them not only for general consultancy work but also for the agency work which they do for the Port Trust. By paying such a retainer, the Bombay Port Trust not only ensures that the services of a competent and approved firm of consultants are readily available, whenever the need arises, but also that the Port Trust derives the benefit of a lower fee than that prescribed in the Consulting Engineers' Association's Rules when any special assignments are entrusted to the Consultants. It is a normal practice for Consulting Engineers to quote a concessional fee to the clients who retain their services on a regular payment of a retention fee. For example, in the case of the Dock Expansion Scheme and Ballard Pier Extension, the fee prescribed by the Consulting Engineers' Association's Rules would be 5½% on the first £500,000, 4½% on the next £500,000 and 4½% on the remainder, while the fee payable under the agreement with the Consulting Engineers is 3½% on the first Rs. 3 crores and 3% on the balance (excluding the

work relating to the Passenger Terminal). The retainer paid to the Consultants is thus off-set by the saving arising from the concessional fee for the special assignments and can, therefore, be considered justifiable.

As regards the seconding of the Port Trust Engineers to the consultants for gaining experience in design work, it may be stated that the secondment is not for long duration and the consultants' work is assessed by senior engineers of the Port Trust, other than those who have been so seconded. Thus, the Port Trust's interests are fully safeguarded.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated 12-12-1966.*]

COMMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE

Please see comments in para 7 of Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendation (Serial No. 22, Para 88)

The Committee consider that the payment of fees on percentage basis to the Consulting Engineers, may give them unintended remuneration on account of increases in the cost of works, due to extraneous reasons like contractors' delays and failures, rise in the cost of labour material etc. and not so much due to additions to their work. The Committee have a feeling that such a system of payment provides no incentive to the Consulting Engineers to economise on costs. Rather, it tends to work the other way as the Consulting Engineers become direct beneficiaries from increases in costs. In fact, the costs of marine oil terminal scheme increased from the original estimates of Rs. 4.49 crores to Rs. 10.25 crores. Similarly, the estimates of Dock Expansion Scheme have been revised upwards from Rs. 10.92 crores to Rs. 13.25 crores. The Committee feel that the fees of Consultants should be fixed in such a manner as to provide incentive for bringing about reduction in the costs of works. The Committee recommend that Government should review the whole matter and lay down principles for the payment of fees to the Consulting Engineers after taking the above factors into account. They would further suggest that Government Port authorities should negotiate with the Consulting Engineers for adjusting their fees in respect of Dock Expansion Scheme and Master Plan in such a manner as to eliminate the accrual of fees on account of increases in cost of works due to extraneous factors.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The payment of fees to the Consultants is generally fixed on the basis prescribed by the Consulting Engineers' Association's Rules.

Except in the cases of assignments in which the work required of the Consultants can be fairly assessed and a fixed fee can be quoted, it is the normal practice to fix the fee on the basis of a time rate or a percentage rate. Under the time rate basis, the fees are payable at an agreed rate for the time devoted to the work by the Consulting Engineers or their staff while under the percentage rate the fee is determinated at an agreed percentage of the actual cost of the work. In large projects, the latter basis is commonly adopted as it provides a definite basis for calculating the fees. It is true that under this method of payment of fees, the Consultants stand to benefit by an increase in the cost of the work. Where such increases are due to an enhancement of the cost on account of additional work, the additional fee would no doubt be justified. But increase in the cost of work resulting from a rise in the cost of labour and materials, whether due to normal rise in the price level or due to contractors' delays and failures, would mean an adventitious addition to the Consultants' fees; but the Consultants contend that any general increase in the price level during the period of their service affects them also in the form of higher salary bills and other expenses and would, therefore, be justified. It may, however, be possible to fix a fee on a percentage basis on the understanding that any increases in the cost due to an escalation in the cost of labour and material would not be taken into account for the calculation of the fee, but then the Consultants would invariably ask for a higher percentage to cover the risk of such escalation. This has been the experience in negotiating the terms for the Dock Expansion Scheme and Balard Pier Extension with the Consulting Engineers. They quoted a fee of 3.7 % and 3.5% without escalation, while they were prepared to accept 3¼% and 3% if escalation was included. As it was felt that the actual escalation would not amount to the extra fee quoted for excluding such escalation, the latter basis, which is also commonly adopted, was preferred.

So far as the Dock Expansion Scheme and Ballard Pier Extension are concerned, the terms were finalised more than four years ago and there does not appear to be any possibility of making any amendment therein at this stage for eliminating accrual of fees on account of cost increases due to extraneous factors. So far as the Master Plan is concerned, the Consulting Engineers are being paid a fixed fee, which is not subject to a change due to any extraneous factors and the question of considering any amendment therein should not, therefore, arise.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI (36)/66, dated* 12-12-1966].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

Please furnish a copy of the Consulting Engineers Association Rules and also indicate the practice obtaining in countries other than the U.K. for payment of fees etc. to the Consulting Engineers.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No. 4/22(1)ECI/65, dated 28-7-1967*].

FURTHER REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT

A copy of the Rules relating to the Association of Consulting Engineers is enclosed.

It is regretted that information is not available regarding the practice obtaining in countries other than the U.K. for payment of fees to the Consulting Engineers.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated 19-8-1967*].

COMMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE

Please see Comments in Para 8 of Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendation (Serial No. 39, Para 118)

The Committee are perturbed to note that as many as 3563 packages are awaiting disposal after two years of confiscation by Customs. The Committee consider that save in sub-judice cases, the Customs Department should expeditiously arrange to hold auctions in suitable lots at frequent intervals to dispose of goods to avoid congestion in the port area and prevent their deterioration due to long storage.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The attention of the Collector of Customs is being invited to the suggestion of the Committee recorded in this paragraph. Apart from this, the Port Trust have been constantly urging the Custom House to expedite sales, by auction, of goods confiscated outright, where such goods are not 'sub judice'.

[*Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Transport Wing), O.M. No. 12-PDI(36)/66, dated 22-12-1967*].

Further Information Called for by the Committee

Please state the latest position regarding action taken by the Customs and the number of packages awaiting disposal.

[*L.S.S. O.M. No.* 4/22(1)*ECI*/65, *dated* 28-7-1967].

Further Reply of the Government

The Bombay Port Trust have stated as follows:—

Out of 3563 packages confiscated by the Customs and referred to herein, 1352 packages have been disposed of by sale by public auction by the Customs authorities as at date. The balance quantity awaiting disposal is 2211 packages.

[*Ministry of Transport and Shipping* (*Transport Wing*), *O.M. No.* 12-*PDI*(36)/66, *dated* 7-9-1967].

Comments of the Committee

Please see comments in Para 12 of Chapter I of the Report.

P. VENKATASUBBAIAH,
Chairman,
Estimates Committee.

New Delhi;
March 6, 1968.

Phalguna 16, 1889 (*Saka*)

APPENDIX

(*Vide* Introduction)

Analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 96th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)

I.	Total Number of recommendations	50
II.	Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government (*vide* recommendations at S. Nos. 1-20, 23-25, 29-38, 40, 42, 44-46 and 48-50)	
	Number	41
	Percentage to total	82
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply (*vide* recommendations at S. Nos. 26-28, 41, 43 and 47)	
	Number	6
	Percentage to total	12
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee (*vide* recommendations at S. Nos. 21, 22 and 39)	
	Number	3
	Percentage to total	6

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
21.	Sat Narain & Sons, 3143, Mohd. Ali Bazar, Mori Gate, Delhi	3
22.	Atma Ram & Sons, Kashmere Gate, Delhi-6.	9
23.	J. M. Jaina & Brothers, Mori Gate, Delhi.	11
24.	The Central News Agency, 23/90, Connaught Place, New Delhi.	15
25.	The English Book Store, 7-L, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.	20
26.	Lakshmi Book Store, 42, Municipal Market, Janpath, New Delhi.	23
27.	Bahree Brothers, 188, Lajpatrai Market, Delhi-6.	27
28.	Jayana Book Depot, Chapparwala Kuan, Karol Bagh, New Delhi.	66
29.	Oxford Book & Stationery Company, Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-1.	68
30.	People's Publishing House, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi.	76
31.	The United Book Agency, 48, Amrit Kaur Market, Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.	88
32.	Hind Book House, 82, Janpath, New Delhi.	95
33.	Bookwell, 4 Sant Narankari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-9.	96

MANIPUR

34.	Shri N. Chaoba Singh, News Agent, Ramlal Paul High School Annex, Imphal.	77

AGENTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

35.	The Secretary, Establishment Department, The High Commission of India, India House, Aldwych, LONDON, W.C.-2.	